

## REMARKS

By this Response, in the present Application, Claims 14-32 are pending, and Claims 14-21 and 24-29 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-13 have been previously cancelled.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 14-32 were finally rejected. More specifically, Claims 14-15, 17-18, 20-22, 24, 26, 29-30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,102,796 to *Pajitnov*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,599,231 to *Hibino et al.* Further, Claims 16, 23 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pajitnov*, in view of *Hibino*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,386,543 to *Luker*. Finally, Claims 19, 25 and 27-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pajitnov*, in view of *Hibino*, and further in view of Applicants' admission of prior art.

Applicants' attorney would also like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview that occurred on 08 April 2003. During the interview, Applicants' attorney and the Examiner discussed the references cited by the Examiner. It was agreed that the cited references do not disclose creating a computer game stored on a system computer; however, the Examiner did not believe that the previously-submitted Claims sufficiently described those distinguishing features. Based on this discussion, Applicants have amended the aforementioned Claims in this Application. In view of the foregoing Amendments and Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that these Amendments be entered and the outstanding rejections be reconsidered.

Further, Applicants submit that any amendments to the Claims that were not made in response to the Examiner's objections or rejections were made for non-statutory purposes. Accordingly, any such amendments should not limit the scope of the invention, which is to be given the full breadth of the claim language and any equivalents thereof.

Based on the foregoing Amendments and Remarks, the present Application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Such action on the part of the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels a telephonic conference would expedite the allowance of the present Application, it is suggested the Examiner contact the undersigned Attorney.

It is further believed that an Extension Of Time Fee is due for filing this Response. The Office is authorized to charge this fee, as well as any deficiencies or refund any overpayments, to our firm's Deposit Account No. 502261.

In re Application of: Hibscher *et al.*  
Application No.: 09/741,564  
Atty Docket No.: 03405.018001

Examiner: A. Enatsky  
Art Unit: 3713

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 05 January 2004



Timothy M. Morella  
Reg. No. 45,277  
Attorney for Applicants

NEAL, GERBER & EISENBERG LLP  
2 North LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60602 3801  
312 269 8000

**Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR § 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this document is being transmitted to the Commissioner for Patents ***via Express Mail No. EV 220577889 US***, this 5<sup>th</sup> Day of January, 2004.

By:   
Michelle A. Cook

NGEDOCs :976212.1